

**JUL 31 2006**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

ARMANDO NUNEZ MIRAMONTES;  
MA DOLORES ROSALES PUENTES,  
a.k.a. Maria Dolores Rosales Fuentes,

Petitioners,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-73403

Agency Nos. A79-612-882  
A79-612-883

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 24, 2006\*\*

Before: ALARCÓN, HAWKINS, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Armando Nunez Miramontes and Ma Dolores Rosales Puentes, husband and  
wife, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be  
cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without  
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We dismiss the petition for review.

The evidence Petitioners presented with their motion to reopen concerned the same basic hardship grounds as their application for cancellation of removal. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 602-03 (9th Cir. 2006). We therefore lack jurisdiction to review the BIA’s discretionary determination that the evidence would not alter its prior discretionary determination that they failed to establish the requisite hardship. *See id.* at 600 (holding that 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i) bars this court from reviewing the denial of a motion to reopen where “the only question presented is whether [the] new evidence altered the prior, underlying discretionary determination that [the petitioner] had not met the hardship standard.”) (Internal quotations and brackets omitted).

Petitioners’ contention that the BIA’s denial of their motion violated their due process rights does not amount to a colorable due process claim. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) (“[t]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction.”).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.**